



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Takeshi ITO, et al.. Group Art Unit: 3681

Serial No. 10/822,685 Examiner: Paumen, Gary F.

Filed: April 13, 2004

For: PLUG CONNECTOR FOR DIFFERENTIAL TRANSMISSION

COMMENTS REGARDING STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

An Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance appears at pages 2-3 of the Detailed Action/Notice of Allowability, part of the Notice of Allowability mailed April 19, 2005. Applicants provide the following Comments thereon, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104(e) and MPEP 1302.14.

As specified in MPEP 1302.14, "care must be taken to ensure that such reasons are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims." It is submitted that the Examiner's Statement does not meet these standards and, instead, raises "possible misinterpretations...and possible estoppel effects" (MPEP 1302.14) and, accordingly, should be disregarded.

The reasons are submitted to be improper, since conveying an unduly narrow scope of the claims and notably sole independent claim 1. For example, the Examiner's Statement recites in the opening lines that "none of the prior art of record discloses all of the specifics of the block body, plate-light ground contact members, ... (etc.)." (Emphasis added). In essence, the Examiner's Statement implies that the Examiner is reading into all of the claims all of the specifics of these recited elements as disclosed in the specification and drawings -- thereby improperly narrowing the scope of the claims. Certainly, claim 1 does not recite "all of the specifics..." of those cited elements, as disclosed in the specification and drawings, -- nor do the dependent claims 2-7.

Furthermore, the Examiner's statement sets forth an apparent claim limitation: "the first and second signal contact members allowing differential transmission..." -- but which appears nowhere in claim 1 nor in any of the other claims nor in the specification. While "differential transmission" is set forth in the preamble of claim 1 as a characteristic of the claimed "plug connector ...," it is not a characteristic recited as being "allowed" by the "first and second signal contact members...."

It is submitted that the claims are not constrained by such limitations as may be implied from the Examiner's Statement, as are noted above, and, instead, that the claims speak for themselves as to what features are included therein and, thus, are their own best evidence as to the reasons for allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 14, 2005

By: H. J. Staas
H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500